## Application No. Applicant(s) KUMAR ET AL. 09/852,095 Intervi w Summary Examiner Art Unit 1751 Brian P Mruk All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Brian P Mruk. (4)\_\_\_\_\_. (2) Rimma Mitelman. Date of Interview: 05 January 2004. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_. Claim(s) discussed: 3. Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Agreement was reached between the examiner and the attorney to amend instant claim 3 to define the variable "G" as a monosaccharide or substituted monosaccharide. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Brun P. Muk Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_\_